

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the present amendment is respectfully requested.

By the present Amendment, the claims have been changed to address the issue raised with the objection to claims 1, 7 and 15. Also, the claims have been changed to further distinguish the claims from the patents to Stewart (U.S. Patent No. 3,391,660) and Rapata (U.S. Patent No. 3,401,906). With regard to both the Stewart and Rapata, it is noted that the disclosed devices have some similar appearance to the present invention. However, for each of the Stewart and Rapata devices, all of the claimed limitations cannot be satisfied. Claim 1 can be used as an example.

With regard to the Stewart device, it is noted that the Office action has identified item 22 as the anchor body, and item 21 as the base plate. As such, the anchor body (item 22) is engaged with the base plate (item 21). However, claim 1 recites that the hollow interior of the anchor body has two open ends and is configured to receive a post within the hollow interior of the anchor body from one open end. In the Stewart device, the item 22 does not have two open ends. Moreover, the leg 10, which can be considered to be a post, cannot extend into item 22.

Also, claim 1 recites that the base plate is connected to the end of the anchor body opposite to the end that receives the post. Again, this limitation cannot be satisfied because the post (leg 10) is not received in item 22.

Further, claim 1 recites that the base plate has an arcuate portion and an upstanding arcuate conical portion, both of which are in an interior of the anchor body. The Stewart device does not have such two portions of item 21 that are inside item 22. At best, only one portion of item 21 is inside item 22.

Still further, claim 1 recites that the anchor body and the conical portion bound an annular area that extends about the conical portion for receiving the hollow lower end of the post, the greatest radial dimension of the conical portion being greater than a complementary dimension of the interior surface of the post to cause the interior surface of the post to slide over the conical portion and the conical portion to frictionally engage the post to prevent lateral movement of the post relative to the base plate. As mentioned, the leg 10 does not go inside item 22 (i.e., item 22 is not open at the second end to even receive the leg 10). Moreover, the leg 10 only engages item 22, and thus cannot even engage item 21. Thus, all of these limitations cannot be met.

With regard to the Rapata device, it is noted that the Office action has identified item 10 as the anchor body, and item 18 as the base plate. As such, the anchor body (item 10) is engaged with the base plate (item 18). However, claim 1 recites that the anchor body has a hollow interior with two open ends and is configured to receive a post within the hollow interior from one open end. In the

Rapata device, the item 10 does not have a hollow interior with two open ends. At best, only one end is open regardless of the end being considered.

Also, claim 1 recites that the base plate is connected to the end of the anchor body opposite to the end that receives the post. Again, this limitation cannot be satisfied because of the lack of the hollow interior with two open ends.

Further, claim 1 recites that the base plate has an arcuate portion and an upstanding arcuate conical portion, both of which are in an interior of the anchor body. The Rapata device does not have such two portions of item 18 that are inside item 10. At best, only one portion of item 18 is inside item 10.

Still further, claim 1 recites that the anchor body and the conical portion bound an annular area that extends about the conical portion for receiving the hollow lower end of the post, the greatest radial dimension of the conical portion being greater than a complementary dimension of the interior surface of the post to cause the interior surface of the post to slide over the conical portion and the conical portion to frictionally engage the post to prevent lateral movement of the post relative to the base plate. In the Rapata device, item 10 (asserted to be the anchor body) is directly engaged against item 18 (asserted to be the base plate). Thus, all of these limitations cannot be met. At best, a post would extend into the receptacle of item 10. However, the receptacle is axially spaced away from item 18 and does not engage item 18.

Appl. No. 10/626,913
Amdt. dated August 5, 2005
Reply to Office action of May 5, 2005

In view of the forgoing it is respectfully submitted that the above-identified application is condition for allowance and allowance of the above-identified application is respectfully requested.

If there are any fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 35451.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 
Ronald M. Kachmarik, Reg. No. 34512

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

August 5, 2005